

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11 and 32 are amended. By this Amendment, no claims are added or cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 26, 31, and 32 are the independent claims.

Because the Amendments to claims 1, 11 and 32 do not present new issues requiring a further search and/or consideration, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter this Amendment and issue a Notice of Allowance in the next USPTO communication.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 13-28 and 31 are allowed.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 and 29-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. For instance, the Examiner asserts that the feature “the first portion of the received data differing from a user identification number” of independent claims 1 and 32 is not supported in the specification. Applicants disagree. This feature is fully supported by at least paragraphs [0028] to [0031] of the specification as filed. Applicants have indicated this in our previous Amendment filed December 5, 2008. In fact, the Examiner has reproduced the portions of Applicants’ December 5, 2008 Amendment that specifically identifies the support for this feature. None-the-less, Applicants have reproduced paragraph [0029] and [0030] below.

**[0029]**The first portion of the modified first permanent identifier contains the routing information to the home system 16, but the second portion or a part thereof, which normally includes the user identification number pre-assigned by the home system 16, includes data from the end user 2.

[0030]The first portion of the modified expanded second permanent identifier includes the pre-established code to trigger the expanded second permanent identifier, and the second portion includes an identification number as did the conventional expanded second permanent identifier. However, the third or expanded portion of the modified expanded second permanent identifier, which normally includes another identification number, includes data from the end user 2.

As can be clearly seen from the above-identified paragraphs, the feature “the first portion of the received data differing from a user identification number” of claims 1 and 32 is fully supported in the original specification as filed. Without conceding to the Examiner’s current position, Applicants have cancelled this feature, and added “the first and second portions not being identification information associated with the mobile communication system” to claims 1 and 32. Support for this feature is provided at least by paragraphs [0029] and [0030] recited above. Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 and 29-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art of instant application (hereinafter “AAPA”), in view of Non-Patent Literature, Mobile IP by James D. Solomon, 1998 Prentice Hall PTR, Prentice Hall, Inc., pages 54-56, dated 9/5/1997 (hereinafter “Solomon”) and further in view of Willey (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,058, hereinafter “Willey”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 32 to recite, *inter alia*, “the first and second portions not being identification information associated with the mobile communication system.” Clearly, the AAPA does **not** disclose these features. In fact, the AAPA discloses the opposite. For instance, the AAPA suggests that the first and second portions **are** identification information associated with the mobile communication system. See paragraphs [0029] and

[0030] reproduced above. Furthermore, for reasons that are readily apparent, the newly cited reference – Willey – does not cure the deficiencies of the AAPA with respect to this feature. For example, the Examiner cites to column 13, lines 3-7 of Willey, which states "[t]he following function returns an integer, using as arguments the mobile station's IMSI or ESN, the number of resources N and a modifier DECORR. The modifier serves to decorrelate the values obtained for the various application from the same mobile station."

The Examiner seems to read the "modifier" of the above-recited portions of Willey on the "first portion" of claims 1 and 32. Applicants disagree. The modifier of Willey does not seem to be part of the IMSI. Rather, the modifier of Willey appears to be completely independent of the IMSI, as well as the number of resources. It appears that Willey uses an (1) IMSI, (2) modifier DECORR, and (3) number of resources, as arguments in a computer function, which is **unrelated** to the features of claim 1. Solomon fails to cure the deficiencies of the AAPA and Willey. Therefore, Solomon, AAPA, and Willey, alone or in combination, cannot render independent claims 1 and 32 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 2-12 and 29-30, dependent on claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura, at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By  No. 64,088 for  
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/JBS:gew